UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,627	04/02/2004	Kia Silverbrook	HYT002US	9659

24011 7590 03/22/2006

SILVERBROOK RESEARCH PTY LTD
393 DARLING STREET
BALMAIN, NSW 2041
AUSTRALIA

EXAMINER	
TAYLOR, APRIL ALICIA	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2876	

DATE MAILED: 03/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/815,627	SILVERBROOK ET AL	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	April A. Taylor	2876	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 April 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-75* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-21,24-38 and 52-67* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *22,23,39-51 and 68-75* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *10/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The co-pending applications are listed with the attorney document numbers, which should be change to US application numbers (see pages 1 and 2). Appropriate correction is required.

3. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 1-75 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 1: Substitute "adapted to scan" with -- for scanning -- (see line 1).

Re claim 11: Substitute "is adapted to sense" with -- senses -- (see line 1).

Re claim 19: Substitute "is adapted to use" with -- uses -- (see line 1).

Re claim 37: Substitute "is adapted to detect" with -- detects -- (see line 1).

Re claim 38: Delete the terms "is adapted to" (see line 1).

Re claim 38: Substitute "determine" with -- determines -- (see lines 2 and 3).

Re claim 38: Substitute "activate" with -- activates -- (see line 4).

Re claim 39: Substitute "centre" with -- center -- (see line 3).

Re claim 40: Substitute "is adapted to distinguish" with -- distinguishes -- (see lines 1-2).

Re claim 48: Substitute "centre" with -- center -- (see line 4).

Re claim 55: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 2).

Re claim 55: Substitute "adapted to convey" with -- for conveying -- (see line 3).

Re claim 56: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 3).

Re claim 56: Substitute "adapted to convey" with -- for conveying -- (see line 4).

Re claim 56: Delete the terms "adapted to" (see line 5).

Re claim 56: Substitute "direct" with -- directs -- (see line 6).

Re claim 56: Substitute "sense" with -- senses -- (see line 11).

Re claim 56: Substitute "generate" with -- generates -- (see line 13).

Re claim 57: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 58: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 59: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 60: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 61: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 62: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 63: Substitute "the presence" with -- a presence -- (see lines 1-2).

Re claim 64: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (lines 1 and 2).

Re claim 65: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 65: Substitute "is adapted to store" with -- stores -- (see line 1).

Re claim 66: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 1).

Re claim 66: Substitute "adapted to communicate" with -- that communicates -- (see lines 1-2).

Re claim 66: Substitute "being adapted to send" with -- sends -- (see line 2).

Re claim 67: Insert the term -- automated -- before the term " check-out" (see line 2).

Re claim 69: Substitute "adapted to scan" with -- for scanning -- (see lines 1-2).

Re claim 69: It is unclear to the examiner to what the term "it" refers to (see line 8).

Re claim 70: Substitute "adapted to scan" with -- for scanning -- (see line 2).

Re claim 71: Substitute "adapted to scan" with -- for scanning -- (see line 2).

Re claim 72: Substitute "adapted to scan" with -- for scanning -- (see line 2).

Re claim 73: Substitute "adapted to scan" with -- for scanning -- (see line 2).

Re claim 73: Substitute "adapted to be held" with -- for being held -- (see line 6).

Re claim 73: It is unclear to the examiner to what the term "it" refers to (see line 9).

Re claim 74: Substitute "adapted to read" with -- for reading -- (see lines 1-2).

Re claim 75: Substitute "adapted to read" with -- for reading -- (see lines 1-2).

Re claim 75: Substitute "adapted to be held" with -- for being held -- (see line 6).

Re claim 75: It is unclear to the examiner to what the term "it" refers to (line 7).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 68 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claim has not been further treated on the merits.

(Note: Claims 2-10, 12-18, 20-36, 41-47 and 49-54 are objected to since they are dependent upon an objected claim)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 2, 3-5, 7-10, 19-21, 23-37, and 52-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bridgelall et al (US 6,330,973) (hereinafter Bridgelall).

Re claim 1: Bridgelall teaches a scanning device for scanning an interface surface provided on a product item, the scanning device having a beam generator for generating at least one scanning beam being directed in first and second orthogonal directions to thereby generate a raster scan pattern over a scanning patch provided in the sensing region; at least one beam controller for directing the at least one scanning beam along selected ones of a number of patch beam paths, each patch beam path extending into the sensing region at a respective angle; a sensor for sensing at least some of the coded data on the interface surface of the product item; and a processor for determining product identity data indicative of the identity of the product item (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 2: Bridgelall teaches wherein the angle between respective patch beam paths can be a variety of different angles (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11,line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 3: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes at least one housing, the patch beam paths extending from respective locations along the housing towards the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; and col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 4: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes at least two housing arranged on opposite sides of the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; and col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 5: Bridgelall teaches wherein the housing is an elongate housing.

Re claim 6: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes at least one conveyor for conveying the product item through the sensing region (see col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59).

Re claim 7: Bridgelall teaches wherein the at least one elongated housing is formed from a column positioned adjacent the conveyor such that the scanning device senses at least some of the coded data as the conveyor causes the product item to pass through the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; and col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 8: Bridgelall teaches wherein the beam controller includes at least one mirror for directing the scanning beam along a selected one of the patch beam paths (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11,line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 9: Bridgelall teaches wherein the beam controller includes a first mirror; a plurality of second mirrors; and a controller which controls the position of the first mirror to thereby reflect the scanning beam from a selected one of the second mirrors into the sensing region (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11, line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 10: Bridgelall teaches wherein each second mirror defines at least one patch beam path, and wherein the controller controls the position of the first mirror to thereby direct the scanning beam along a selected patch beam path (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11,line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 11: Bridgelall teaches wherein the sensor senses radiation reflected from the product item along the selected patch beam path (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11,line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 12: Bridgelall teaches wherein the coded data encodes an EPC associated with the product item, and wherein a processor determines the EPC (see col. 13, line 24+; and col. 18, line 46 to col. 19, line 50).

Re claim 13: Bridgelall teaches wherein the product identity data distinguishes the product item from every other product item (see col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59, col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claims 14 and 15: Bridgelall teaches wherein a processor generates scan data representing the identity of the scanned product item (see col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59, col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 24: Bridgelall teaches wherein the interface surface includes at least one region, the region including coded data indicative of an identity of the region, and wherein a processor determines the identity of the at least one region from at least some of the sensed coded data (see col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59, col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 25: Bridgelall teaches wherein the at least one region includes at least one coded data portion, and wherein the coded data portion is indicative of the region identity (see col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59, col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 26: Bridgelall teaches wherein the coded data includes at a plurality of locations on the interface surface, a corresponding plurality of coded data portions, each coded data portion being indicative of an identity of the interface surface and the position of the coded data

portion on the interface surface, and wherein a processor uses the sensed coded data portion to thereby:

i) determine the identity of the interface surface;

ii) determine position data representing a position of the sensed coded data portion on the interface surface;

iii) determine a description of the interface surface using the determined identity; and

iv) identify the at least one region from the description and the position data. (See col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59, col. 18 to col. 19)

Re claim 27: Bridgelall teaches wherein the at least one region represents a user interactive element (see col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59, col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 29: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes at least one deflector for deflecting the scanning beam in first and second orthogonal directions to thereby generate a raster scan pattern over a scanning patch (col. 17, line 5+; col. 20, lines 7-18).

Re claim 30: Bridgelall teaches wherein the at least one deflector includes resonant scanning mirrors (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11, line 63; and col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 31: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes an amplitude modulator for modulating the amplitude of the scanning beam (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11, line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 32: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device determines from radiation sensed by the senor, using the modulation of the scanning beam, ambient light incident on the sensor; determines from radiation sensed by the sensor, using the determined ambient light

incident on the senor, the radiation reflected from the interface surface; and senses the coded data from the radiation reflected from the interface surface (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11, line 63).

Re claim 33: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes a focusing element positioned between the amplitude modulator and the at least one deflector for focusing the beam (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11,line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 34: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes a bandpass filter for filtering radiation incident on the sensor (see col. 11, line 9).

Re claim 36: Bridgelall teaches wherein the beam generator is a laser.

Re claim 37: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device detects the presence of a plurality of product items in the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 52: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device senses coded data from the interface surfaces of a number of product items substantially simultaneously (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 53: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device further includes a memory (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 54: Bridgelall teaches wherein the coded data is disposed over at least one of an entire product surface; a packaging; and a label (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 55: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device is being provided in an automated check-out, the coded data being disposes over a substantial portion of the interface surface, the automated check-out comprising a conveyor for conveying the product item through

the sensing region, wherein the scanning device directs the at least one scanning beam at the sensing region so as to sense at least some of the coded data as the conveyor causes the product item to pass through the sensing region. (See col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 56: Bridgelall teaches an automated checkout comprising:

a conveyor;

at least one scanning device that:

directs at least one scanning beam a) in first and second orthogonal directions to thereby generate a raster scan pattern over a scanning patch provided in the sensing region; and b) along selected ones of a number of patch beam paths, each patch beam path extending into the sensing region at a respective angle;

senses at least some of the coded data on the interface surface of a product item as the conveyor causes the product item to pass through the sensing region; and

generates, using at least some of the sensed coded data, product identity data indicative of the identity of the product item. (See col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; and col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 57: Bridgelall teaches wherein the angle between respective patch beam paths can be a variety of different angles (see col. 10, line 40 to col. 11,line 63; col. 17, line 5+).

Re claim 58: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes at least one housing, the patch beam paths extending from respective locations along the housing towards the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; and col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 59: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning device includes at least two housing arranged on opposite sides of the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; and col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 60: Bridgelall teaches wherein the housing is an elongate housing.

Re claim 61: Bridgelall teaches wherein the at least one elongated housing is formed from a column positioned adjacent the conveyor such that the scanning device senses at least some of the coded data as the conveyor causes the product item to pass through the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; and col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claims 62 and 64: Bridgelall teaches wherein the automated checkout includes an alarm for activation in response to the detection of a scanning error, and wherein the alarm is an audible alarm signal (see col. 18, lines 31+).

Re claim 63: Bridgelall teaches wherein the scanning error includes at least sensing the presence of a plurality of product items in the sensing region (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claims 65 and 67: Bridgelall teaches wherein the automated check-out stores scan data indicative of the identity of the product item in memory; and wherein the memory is located in at least one of the automated check-out; and a computer system (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Re claim 66: Bridgelall teaches wherein the automated checkout further includes a communicator for communicating with a computer system at least one of the product identity data; and the scan data (see col. 9 to col. 10; col. 14, line 35 to col. 16, line 59; col. 18 to col. 19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claim 35 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridgelall e al (US 6,330,973) (hereinafter Bridgelall) in view of Outwater et al (US 6,203,069) (hereinafter Outwater). The teachings of Bridgelall have been discussed above.

Bridgelall fails to teach or fairly suggest wherein the coded data is printed on the interface surface in infrared ink, and the scanning beam is an infrared scanning beam.

Outwater teaches a product authentication system comprising a label having a barcode that is printed in infrared ink, and a scanner for emitting an infrared scanning beam (see abstract; and col. 4, line 5 to col. 5, line 12). In view of Outwater's teaching, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a scanning/reading device for scanning/reading a barcode printed in infrared ink, and wherein the scanner/reader emits an infrared scanning beam to the teachings of Bridgelall in order to secure the data printed on the product and to prevent counterfeiters from reproducing the code.

9. Claims 16, 17, 28, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridgelall e al (US 6,330,973) (hereinafter Bridgelall).

Re claim 16: Bridgelall fails to teach or fairly suggest wherein the processor generates the read data if the determined product identity data is different to product identity data determined

during previous read events. However, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a processor that generates the read data if the determined product identity data is different to product identity data determined during previous read events in order to prevent a product from being scanned more than once.

Re claim 17: Bridgelall fails to teach or fairly suggest wherein the processor compares the determined product identity data to previously determined product identity data; and generates read data representing the identity of the product item if the determined product identity data has not been previously determined. However, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a processor that compares the determined product identity data to previously determined product identity data; and generates read data representing the identity of the product item if the determined product identity data has not been previously determined in order to prevent a product from being scanned more than once.

Re claim 28: Bridgelall fails to specifically teach or fairly suggest wherein the interface surface is printed using a printer to print the information and coded data. Since Bridgelall does teach a system for reading indicia printed on a product, it is inherent that using a printer prints the indicia on the product.

Re claim 38: Bridgelall fails to teach or fairly suggest wherein the processor activates an alarm if the determined product identity data is indicative of more than one product item. However, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a processor that activates an alarm if the determined product

identity data is indicative of more than one product item in order to notify the operator that different products have the same product identification.

10. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridgelall et al (US 6,330,973) (hereinafter Bridgelall) in view of Roustaei et al (US 6,685,095) (hereinafter Roustaei). The teachings of Bridgelall have been discussed above.

Bridgelall fails to teach or fairly suggest wherein the coded data is redundantly encoded using Reed-Solomon encoding; wherein the processor uses the redundantly encoded data to detect one or more errors in the coded data; and wherein the reading device corrects the one or more detected errors.

Roustaei teaches an optical code reading system wherein a coded data is redundantly encoded using Reed-Solomon encoding; wherein the processor uses the redundantly encoded data to detect one or more errors in the coded data; and wherein the reading device corrects the one or more detected errors (see abstract; col. 3, line 66 to col. 4, line 16; and col. 4, line 54 to col. 5, line 8). In view of Roustaei's teaching, it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the well known Reed-Solomon code; and a system for detecting errors in the coded data and correcting the detected errors to the teachings of Bridgelall in order to ensure that the information read from the encoded data is accurate.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 22, 23, 39-51 and 69-75 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

12. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art of record, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or fairly suggest, in conjunction with other limitations in the claims, wherein the coded data is indicative of a plurality of reference points; wherein each reference point corresponds to a respective location on the interface surface; and wherein the processor generates position data representing the position of a sensed reference point on the interface surface.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Iizaka et al (US 5,679,941) discloses a checkout device for a point-of-sale system.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April A. Taylor whose telephone number is (571) 272-2403. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 6:30AM - 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael G. Lee can be reached on (571) 272-2398. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [april.taylor@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly signed express waiver of the

confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AAT
20 March 2006

THIEN M. LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER